arXiv:0904.2316v1 [math.PR] 15 Apr 2009

Supremum of Random Dirichlet Polynomials with Sub-multiplicative Coefficients

Michel Weber

April 15, 2009

Abstract

We study the supremum of random Dirichlet polynomials $D_N(t) = \sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon_n d(n) n^{-s}$, where (ε_n) is a sequence of independent Rademacher random variables, and d is a sub-multiplicative function. The approach is gaussian and entirely based on comparison properties of Gaussian processes, with no use of the metric entropy method.

1 Introduction

Let $\varepsilon = \{\varepsilon_n, n \geq 1\}$ denote a sequence of independent Rademacher random variables ($\mathbf{P}\{\varepsilon_i = \pm 1\} = 1/2$) defined on a basic probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P})$. Consider the random Dirichlet polynomials in which $s = \sigma + it$,

$$\mathcal{D}(s) = \sum_{n=1}^N \varepsilon_n d(n) n^{-s}. \tag{1}$$

In a recent work [9], (see references therein for related results, notably Queffelec's works) we obtained sharp estimates of the supremum of $\mathcal{D}(s)$, under moderate growth condition on coefficients. Put

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(M) &= \sum_{m=1}^M d(m), \qquad \widetilde{D}_1(M) = \max_{1\leq m\leq M} \frac{D_1(m)}{m}, \\ D_2(M) &= \sum_{m=1}^M d(m)^2, \qquad \widetilde{D}_2^2(M) = \max_{1\leq m\leq M} \frac{D_2(m)}{m}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

We showed

Theorem 1 *Let $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1/2$ and assume that*

$$d(kp^j) \leq C d(k) j^H \tag{3}$$

for some positive C, H, any positive integer k, j and any prime p. Then there exists a constant $C_{\sigma,d}$ depending on d and σ such that for any integer $N \geq 2$

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}} \big|\mathcal{D}(\sigma + it)\big| \leq C_{\sigma,d} \, \frac{N^{1-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)}{\log N} \ . \tag{4}$$

Moreover, if for some $b < 1/(\sqrt{5}+1) \approx 0.31$

$$\widetilde{D}_2(M) \le CM^b, \tag{5}$$

then

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}} \big|\mathcal{D}(\sigma+it)\big| \le C_{\sigma,d}\, \frac{N^{1-\sigma}}{\log N} \ . \tag{6}$$

Suppose $d(n)$ is a multiplicative function: $d(nm) \le d(n)d(m)$ if n, m are coprimes. Then condition (3) is satisfied iff

$$d(p^{r+j}) \le Cd(p^r)j^H, \tag{7}$$

for some $C > 0$, $H > 0$ and any $j \ge 1$, $r \ge 0$. This last condition is fulfilled when for instance

$$\frac{d(p^{k+1})}{d(p^k)} \le (1+\frac{1}{k})^H, \qquad k = 0, 1, \dots \tag{8}$$

a property which is satisfied for a relatively wide class of multiplicative functions, among them, the divisor function and $d_1(n) = \lambda^{\omega(n)}$, where $\lambda > 1$ and $\omega(n) = \#\{p : p \mid n\}$ is well-known additive prime divisor function.

However, condition (3) requires that $d(p^j) = \mathcal{O}(j^H)$. Thus Theorem 1 does not apply to some classical multiplicative functions such as

$$d_2(n) = \lambda^{\Omega(n)},$$

where $\Omega(n) = \sum_{p^\nu || n} \nu$ is the other prime divisor function.

The main concern of this work is to show that the approach used in [9] can be still adapted and further, simplified, to obtain extensions for a much larger class of multiplicative functions including these examples, and also for sub-multiplicative functions, namely functions satisfying the weaker condition:

$$d(nm) \le d(n)d(m) \qquad \text{provided } (n,m) = 1. \tag{9}$$

For instance, $d(n) = e^{(\log n)^\alpha}$, $0 < \alpha < 1$ is sub-multiplicative, as well as function $d_K(n) = \chi\{(n,K) = 1\}$ in Example 2. The related random Dirichlet polynomials are studied in this paper.

We obtain a general upper bound, which also contains and improve the main results in [8], [9] (Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1 respectively). Introduce some notation. Let $2 = p_1 < p_2 < \dots$ be the sequence of all primes, and let $\pi(N)$ denote the number of prime numbers less or equal to N. The following decomposition is basic

$$\{2, \dots, N\} = \sum_{j=1}^{\pi(N)} E_j \qquad \text{where} \qquad E_j = \big\{2 \le n \le N : P^+(n) = p_j\big\},$$

$P^+(n)$ being the largest prime divisor of n. It is natural to disregard cells E_j such that $d(n) \equiv 0$, $n \in E_j$. We thus set

$$\mathcal{H}_d = \big\{1 \le j \le \pi(N) : \ d_{|E_j} \not\equiv 0\big\}, \qquad \tau_d = \max(H_d).$$

Consider now the following condition:

$$p \mid n \implies d(n) \le C\, d(\frac{n}{p}), \qquad \text{and} \qquad d(p^j) \le C_1 \lambda^j, \tag{10}$$

for some positive C, C_1, λ with $\lambda < \sqrt{2}$, any prime number p, any integers n, j. Clearly, if $C < \sqrt{2}$, the second property is implied by the first. But this is not always so. Consider the following example. Fix some prime number P_1 as well some reals $1 < \lambda_1 < \sqrt{2}$, $C_1 \ge 1$, and put

$$d(n) = \begin{cases} C_1 \lambda^j, & \text{if } P_1^j \,||\, n, \\ 1, & \text{if } (n, P_1) = 1. \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

Then d is sub-multiplicative, and satisfies condition (10) with a constant C which has to be larger than $C_1\lambda$.

That d be sub-multiplicative is easy: let n, m be coprime integers. If $(n, P_1) = 1$ and $(m, P_1) = 1$, then $d(n) = d(m) = d(nm) = 1$. If $P_1^j||n$ and $(m, P_1) = 1$, then $d(n) = C_1\lambda^j$, $d(m) = 1$; so $d(nm) = d(n) = d(n)d(m)$. Finally if $P_1^j||n$ and $P_1^k||m$, then $d(nm) = C_1\lambda^{\max(j,k)} \le C_1^2 \lambda^{j+k} = d(n)d(m)$.

Now let p be such that $p|n$. If $p \neq P_1$, either $P_1 \not| n$ and then $d(n) = d(n/p) = 1$, or $P_1^j||n$ and $d(n) = d(n/p) = C_1\lambda^j$. If $p = P_1$, assume first $P_1||n$, then $d(n/p) = 1$, and in order that $d(n) = C_1\lambda \le Cd(n/p)$, one must take $C \ge C_1\lambda$. Finally if $P_1^j||n$ with $j \ge 2$, then $d(n) = C_1\lambda^j = \lambda d(n/p) \le Cd(n/p)$. It remains to observe that $d(p^j) = 1 \le C_1\lambda^j$, if $p \neq P_1$; and by definition $d(P_1^j) = C_1\lambda^j$. This proves our claim.

More generally, let $P_1 < \ldots < P_J$ be J prime numbers, together with reals $C_1 < \ldots < C_J$ and $\lambda_1 < \ldots < \lambda_J$ such that $1 < \lambda_j < \sqrt{2}$ and $C_j \ge 1$ for all j, and form the corresponding functions $d_1, \ldots d_J$. The product of sub-multiplicative functions being again a sub-multiplicative function, we deduce that the product $d = d_1 \ldots . d_J$ is another example of sub-multiplicative function satisfying condition (10), with a constant C which has to be greater than $C_1\lambda_1 \ldots C_J\lambda_J$.

We prove

Theorem 2 *Let d be a non-negative sub-multiplicative function. Assume that condition (10) is realized. Let $0 \le \sigma < 1/2$. Then there exists a constant $C_{\sigma,d}$ depending on σ and d only, such that for any integer $N \ge 2$,*

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{t \in \mathbf{R}} |\mathcal{D}(\sigma + it)| \le C_{\sigma,d}\, \widetilde{D}_2(N)\, B,$$

where

$$B = \begin{cases} \frac{N^{1/2-\sigma}\tau_d^{1/2}}{(\log N)^{1/2}} & \text{, if } \left(\frac{N \log\log N}{\log N}\right)^{1/2} \le \tau_d \le \pi(N), \\ \frac{N^{3/4-\sigma}(\log\log N)^{1/4}}{(\log N)^{3/4}} & \text{, if } \left(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N}\right)^{1/2} \le \tau_d \le \left(\frac{N\log\log N}{\log N}\right)^{1/2}, \\ N^{1/2-\sigma}\left(\frac{\tau_d \log\log \tau_d}{\log \tau_d}\right)^{1/2} & \text{, if } 1 \le \tau_d \le \left(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N}\right)^{1/2}. \end{cases}$$

Observe that condition (3) implies condition (10). Indeed, write $n = kp$ and take $j = 1$. We get $d(n) = d(kp) \le Cd(k) = Cd(n/p)$. Fix some real λ, $1 < \lambda < \sqrt{2}$. Then $d(p^j) \le Cd(1)j^H \le C_1\lambda^j$, for some suitable constant C_1.

Further, function d_1 obviously satisfies condition (10), whereas we know that it does not satisfy condition (3).

The bounds given in Theorem 2 being all less than $C_{\sigma,\lambda}\widetilde{D}_2(N)\,\frac{N^{1-\sigma}}{\log N}$, we therefore deduce that Theorem 1 is strictly included in Theorem 2. We give two classes of examples of application.

Example 1. Consider multiplicative functions satisfying the following condition:

$$\frac{d(p^a)}{d(p^{a-1})} \le \lambda, \qquad a = 1, 2, \ldots \tag{12}$$

Clearly (12) is strictly weaker than (8). Further it implies (10). First $d(p^j) \le d(1)\lambda^j$. Next, let $p \mid n$ and a denote the p-valuation of n: $p^a||n$. By multiplicativity of $d(.)$ and condition (12)

$$d(n) = d(\frac{n}{p^a})\,d(p^a) = d(\frac{n}{p^a})\,d(p^{a-1})\,\frac{d(p^a)}{d(p^{a-1})} = d(\frac{n}{p})\frac{d(p^a)}{d(p^{a-1})} \le \lambda\,d(\frac{n}{p}).$$

Thus (10) is fulfilled. Notice that (12) implies

$$M_d := \sup_p d(p) < \infty \tag{13}$$

with $M_d \le \lambda d(1)$.

Under condition (12), estimates for $\widetilde{D}_2(N)$ are known. By theorem 2 of [4] (see also [3]), any non-negative multiplicative function d satisfying a Wirsing type condition

$$d(p^m) \le \lambda_1\lambda_2^m, \tag{14}$$

for some constants $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $0 < \lambda_2 < 2$ and all prime powers $p^m \le x$, also satisfies

$$\frac{1}{x}\sum_{n\le x} d(n) \le C(\lambda_1,\lambda_2)\exp\Big\{\sum_{p\le x}\frac{d(p)-1}{p}\Big\}, \tag{15}$$

where $C(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ depends on λ_1, λ_2 only.

As d satisfies (12), if $\lambda < \sqrt{2}$, condition (14) is verified with $\lambda_1 = M_d$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda$. Since d^2 is multiplicative and satisfies (12) with $\lambda^2 < 2$, we also have that d^2 verifies condition (14) as well. Consequently, from (15) follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{D}_1(N) &\le C(\lambda)\exp\Big\{\sum_{p\le N}\frac{d(p)-1}{p}\Big\}\\ \widetilde{D}_2(N) &\le C(\lambda)\exp\Big\{\sum_{p\le N}\frac{d^2(p)-1}{p}\Big\},\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

for some constant $C(\lambda)$ depending on λ only. Recall that there exists an absolute constant c_1 such that for $x \ge 2$

$$\Big|\sum_{p\le x}\frac{1}{p} - \log\log x - c_1\Big| < \frac{5}{\log x}. \tag{17}$$

Thus

$$\sum_{p\le x}\frac{d(p)}{p} \le M_d\sum_{p\le x}\frac{1}{p} \le M_d\log(c_2\log x)$$

and similarly

$$\sum_{p\le x}\frac{d^2(p)}{p}\le M_d^2\log(c_2\log x).$$

Thereby under condition (12), we have the following estimates

$$\widetilde{D}_1(N)\le C(\lambda)(\log N)^{M_d},\qquad \widetilde{D}_2(N)\le C(\lambda)(\log N)^{M_d^2}. \tag{18}$$

For functions d_1, d_2, there is also a standard way to proceed. Letting $\tau=\pi(N)$, we have for d_2 for instance

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n\le N}\lambda^{\Omega(n)}\le\sum_{n\le N}\frac{\lambda^{\Omega(n)}}{n}\le\sum_{\alpha_1=0}^{\infty}\cdots\sum_{\alpha_\tau=0}^{\infty}\frac{\lambda^{\alpha_1+\ldots+\alpha_\tau}}{p_1^{\alpha_1}\ldots p_\tau^{\alpha_\tau}}=\prod_{j=1}^{\tau}\Big(1-\frac{\lambda}{p_j}\Big)^{-1}$$

which can be evaluated by means of (17).

The restriction $\lambda<2$ can be relaxed into $\lambda<q$, when considering, instead of $\mathcal{D}(s)$, random Dirichlet polynomials based on sets of integers having all their prime divisors greater or equal to q, e.g. on some arithmetic progressions. To go beyond a condition of type (12), notably to work under the weaker condition (14), one has probably to perform another approach than the one based on a decomposition into random processes as appearing in (36) below.

Example 2. Take some positive integer K, and put

$$d_K(n)=\begin{cases}1, & \text{if } (n,K)=1\\ 0, & \text{if } (n,K)>1.\end{cases}$$

Then d_K is sub-multiplicative. Let $p\,|n$. By definition, $d_K(n/p)=0$ iff $(n/p,K)>1$, in which case $(n,K)>1$ and so $d_K(n)=0$. Thus $d_K(n)\le d_K(n/p)$. Now if $d_K(n/p)=1$, that $d_K(n)\le d_K(n/p)$ is trivial. Besides $d_K(p^j)=d_K(p)\le 1$. Therefore condition (10) is satisfied with $C=1=\lambda$. And by (1), this defines the remarkable class of random Dirichlet polynomials,

$$\mathcal{D}(s)=\sum_{\substack{(n,K)=1\\1\le n\le N}}\frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^s}, \tag{19}$$

which naturally extends the one of $\mathcal{E}_\tau$-based Dirichlet polynomials considered in [11] and [8]. Indeed, recall that $\mathcal{E}_\tau=\big\{2\le n\le N: P^+(n)\le p_\tau\big\}$. Define

$$K_\tau=\begin{cases}\prod_{\tau<\ell\le\pi(N)}p_\ell & \text{if } \tau<\pi(N)\\ 1 & \text{if }\ \tau=\pi(N)\ .\end{cases} \tag{20}$$

Then $n\in\mathcal{E}_\tau$, $n\le N$, iff $(n,K_\tau)=1$, namely $d_{K_\tau}(n)=1$. So that

$$\sum_{n\in\mathcal{E}_\tau}\frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^s}=\sum_{n=1}^{N}d_{K_\tau}(n)\frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^s}. \tag{21}$$

Consequently, the $\mathcal{E}_\tau$-based Dirichlet polynomials are one example of Dirichlet polynomials with sub-multiplicative weights. Here $\mathcal{H}_{d_{K_\tau}}=\sum_{j\le\tau}E_j$. We therefore neglect cells E_j, $j>\tau$. Further, we have $\widetilde{D}_1(N)=\widetilde{D}_2(N)\le 1$.

If we now specify Theorem 2 to this case, we get

Corollary 3 *Let $0 < \sigma < 1/2$. We have*

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}} \Big| \sum_{n\in\mathcal{E}_\tau} \frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^{\sigma+it}} \Big| \le C_\sigma\, B, \qquad \text{where} \tag{22}$$

$$B = \begin{cases} \frac{N^{1/2-\sigma}\tau^{1/2}}{(\log N)^{1/2}} & , \text{ if } \ \big(\frac{N\log\log N}{\log N}\big)^{1/2} \le \tau \le \pi(N), \\ \frac{N^{3/4-\sigma}(\log\log N)^{1/4}}{(\log N)^{3/4}} & , \text{ if } \ \big(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N}\big)^{1/2} \le \tau \le \big(\frac{N\log\log N}{\log N}\big)^{1/2}, \\ N^{1/2-\sigma}\big(\frac{\tau\log\log\tau}{\log\tau}\big)^{1/2} & , \text{ if } \ 1 \le \tau \le \big(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N}\big)^{1/2}. \end{cases}$$

By comparing this with the upper bound part of Theorem 1.1 in [8], we observe that the bounds obtained are either identical (if $N^{1/2} \le \tau \le \pi(N)$), or strictly better. For instance, when $(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N})^{1/2} \le \tau \le \big(\frac{N\log\log N}{\log N}\big)^{1/2}$, we have

$$\frac{N^{3/4-\sigma}(\log\log N)^{1/4}}{(\log N)^{3/4}} \ll \frac{N^{3/4-\sigma}}{(\log N)^{1/2}},$$

thereby yielding a better bound.

When the order of τ is small, we will prove the following strenghtening in which N disappears from the estimates. Put

$$\Pi_\sigma(\tau) = \prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau} \Big[\frac{1}{1-p_\ell^{-2\sigma}}\Big].$$

Theorem 4 *Assume that $\tau = o(\log N)$. Let $0 < \sigma < 1/2$. Then, there are c_σ, C_σ depending on σ only, such that*

$$c_\sigma \frac{\Pi_\sigma(\tau)^{1/2}\,\tau^{1-\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^\sigma} \le \mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}} \Big| \sum_{\substack{n\le N \\ P^+(n)\le p_\tau}} \frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^{\sigma+it}} \Big| \le C_\sigma \Big(\frac{\Pi_\sigma(\tau)^{1/2}\,\tau^{\frac{3}{2}-2\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{2\sigma}}\Big). \tag{23}$$

And if $\sigma = 1/2$, there are absolute constants C_1, C_2 such that

$$C_1\tau^{1/2} \le \mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}} \Big| \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \sum_{n\in E_j} \frac{\varepsilon_n}{\sqrt{n}} n^{-it} \Big| \le C_2 \tau^{1/2}(\log\log\tau)^{1/2}.$$

Let now K be unspecified. There is no loss to assume K is squarefree. First examine the case when K has few prime divisors. Suppose

$$\sum_{\substack{p|K \\ p\le N}} \frac{1}{p^\sigma} = o\Big(\frac{N^{1-\sigma}}{\log N}\Big). \tag{24}$$

Using Bohr's lower bound

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}} \Big| \sum_{\substack{(n,K)=1 \\ 1\le n\le N}} \frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^s} \Big| \ge C \sum_{\substack{(p,K)=1 \\ p\le N}} \frac{1}{p^\sigma}. \tag{25}$$

We get with 2 a two-sided estimate

$$C\,\frac{N^{1-\sigma}}{\log N} \le \mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}\Big|\sum_{\substack{(n,K)=1\\1\le n\le N}}\frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^s}\Big| \le C\,\frac{N^{1-\sigma}}{\log N}\,. \tag{26}$$

The case of a number K with many prime divisors is more complicated. By the comment previously made, this concerns the case

$$\sum_{\substack{p|K\\p\le N}}\frac{1}{p^\sigma} \asymp \frac{N^{1-\sigma}}{\log N}. \tag{27}$$

We restrict ourselve to integers K of type

$$K=\prod_{\substack{p|K\\p\le p_\nu}}p\cdot\prod_{p_\nu<p\le N}p,$$

where $1\le\nu<\pi(N)$. This amounts to consider the random Dirichlet polynomials

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le n\le N\\(n,K)=1}}\frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^s}=\sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu\\(n,K)=1}}\frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^s}.$$

We will assume ν to be not too large. More precisely, we assume, in accordance with Corollary 3

$$\nu\le\Big(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N}\Big)^{1/2}.$$

Theorem 5 *Let $0<\sigma<1/2$. There exists a constant C_σ depending on σ only such that*

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}\Big|\sum_{(n,K)=1}\frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^s}\Big|\le C_\sigma\,N^{1/2-\sigma}\max\Big(1,\sum_{\substack{k\le\nu\\p_k\not|K}}\frac{1}{p_k}\Big)^{1/2}\Big[\sum_{\substack{k\le\nu\\p_k\not|K}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_k}}\Big].$$

Example 3. Fix some integer $N\ge1$, and consider the truncated divisor function

$$d_N(n)=\#\{k\le N:k|n\}.$$

This function, which occurs in many important arithmetical questions, is submultiplicative. Take n and m coprimes. If $k\le N$ is such that $k|mn$, then k is uniquely written $k=k_1k_2$, $(k_1,k_2)=1$, $k_1|m$, $k_2|n$; and naturally $k_1\le N$, $k_2\le N$. We infer that $d_N(mn)\le d_N(m)d_N(n)$.

Further, it satisfies our condition (10). Let $p|n$, if $p>N$ then $d_N(n)=d_N(\frac{n}{p})$. Otherwise, if $p\le N$, let $\mathcal{K}=\{k\le N:(k,p)=1\}$. For $k\in\mathcal{K}$ such that $k|n$, the p-height $p(k)$ of k denotes the largest integer a so that $p^ak|n$ and $p^ak\le N$. The divisors of n are of type p^ak, $k\in\mathcal{K}$. Further if $p^ak_1=p^bk_2$, $k_1,k_2\in\mathcal{K}$, necessarily $k_1=k_2$. Indeed, it is obvious if $a=b$; and if $a>b$ we get $p|k_2$, which excluded. Consequently

$$d_N(n)=\sum_{\substack{k\in\mathcal{K}\\k|n}}(1+p(k)),\qquad d_N(\frac{n}{p})=\sum_{\substack{k\in\mathcal{K}\\k|n}}[1+(p(k)-1)^+].$$

As for any integer $a \geq 0$, $1 + a \leq 2[1 + (a-1)^+]$, we deduce

$$d_N(n) \leq 2d_N(\frac{n}{p}).$$

And choosing any $\lambda > 1$, we obviously have $d_N(p^j) = \#\{\ell \leq j : p^\ell \leq N\} \leq j \leq C\lambda^j$.

2 Proof of Theorem 2.

Although the proofs are much in the spirit of proofs of the main results in [8],[9], there are substancial changes and simplifications. First, we work from the beginning with Gaussian processes. Further, the delicate step of estimating some related metric and computing associated entropy numbers is notably simplified. Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality and the comparison properties of Gaussian processes indeed allow to avoid any computation (see before (58)), and also give rise to strictly better estimates.

This further allowed us to consider random Dirichlet polynomials with more complicated arithmetical structure, like the one of "Hall type" built from the sub-multiplicative functions d_K, where entropy numbers seem hard to estimate efficiently.

Let $\tau = \tau_d$ and let $a_j(n)$ denote the p_j-valuation of integer n. Put

$$\underline{a}(n) = \big\{a_j(n), 1 \leq j \leq \tau\big\}, \qquad (n \leq N).$$

Let also $\mathbf{T} = [0, 1[= \mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z}$ be the torus. A first classical reduction allows to replace the Dirichlet polynomial by some relevant trigonometric polynomial. To any Dirichlet polynomial $P(s) = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n n^{-s}$, associate the trigonometric polynomial $Q(\underline{z})$ defined by

$$Q(\underline{z}) = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n n^{-\sigma} e^{2i\pi\langle \underline{a}(n), \underline{z}\rangle}, \qquad \underline{z} = (z_1, \ldots, z_\tau) \in \mathbf{T}^\tau.$$

By Kronecker's Theorem ([5], Theorem 442)

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}} \big|P(\sigma + it)\big| = \sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\tau} \big|Q(\underline{z})\big|, \tag{28}$$

as observed in [1].

Remark 6 Naturally, no similar reduction occurs when considering the supremum over a given bounded interval I. However, when the length of I is of exponential size with respect to the degree of P, precisely when

$$|I| \geq e^{(1+\varepsilon)\omega N(\log N\omega)\log N},$$

the related supremum becomes comparable, for ω large, to the one taken on the real line, with an error term of order $\mathcal{O}(\omega^{-1})$. This is in turn a rather general phenomenon due to existence of "localized" versions of Kronecker's theorem; and in the present case to Turán's estimate (see [15] for a slighly improved form of it, and references therein). When the length is of sub-exponential order, the study still seems to belong to the field of application of the general theory of regularity of stochastic processes.

In the technical lemma below, we collected some useful estimates, which already appeared in [9], and are easily deduced from the fact that if a_n are complex numbers and $b \in \mathcal{C}^1([1,x])$, then

$$\sum_{1\le n\le x} a_n b(n) = A(x)b(x) - \int_1^x A(t)b'(t)dt, \tag{29}$$

where we let $A(t) = \sum_{n\le t} a_n$.

Lemma 7 *Let $M \le N$ and $0<\sigma<1/2$. Then*

$$\sum_{m\le M} \frac{d(m)^2}{m^{2\sigma}} \le C\widetilde{D}_2^2(M)M^{1-2\sigma}. \tag{30}$$

$$\sum_{m\le M} (\frac{N}{m})^{1/2}\ (\log(\frac{N}{m}))^{-1/2} d(m) \le C\widetilde{D}_1(M)(NM)^{1/2}\ (\log(\frac{N}{M}))^{-1/2}. \tag{31}$$

$$\sum_{k\le M} \frac{d(k)^2}{k^{2\sigma}} \le C\widetilde{D}_2(M)^2(M)^{1-2\sigma}. \tag{32}$$

Now we can pass to the proof of Theorem 2. Fix some integer ν in $[1,\tau]$. We denote

$$F_\nu = \sum_{1\le j\le \nu} E_j, \qquad F^\nu = \sum_{\nu<j\le\tau} E_j.$$

Consider as in [8],[9] the decomposition $Q = Q_1^\varepsilon + Q_2^\varepsilon$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1^\varepsilon(\underline{z}) &= \sum_{n\in F_\nu} \varepsilon_n d(n) n^{-\sigma} e^{2i\pi\langle \underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle}, \\ Q_2^\varepsilon(\underline{z}) &= \sum_{n\in F^\nu} \varepsilon_n d(n) n^{-\sigma} e^{2i\pi\langle \underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle}. \end{aligned}$$

By the contraction principle ([6] p.16-17)

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\tau} \big|Q_i^\varepsilon(\underline{z})\big| \le 4\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}\, \mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\tau} \big|Q_i(\underline{z})\big|, \qquad (i=1,2) \tag{33}$$

where Q_i is the same process as Q_i^ε except that the Rademacher random variables ε_n are replaced by independent $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ random variables μ_n. Consequently, both the supremums of Q_1 and of Q_2 can be estimated, via their associated L^2-metric.

Assume first $0<\sigma<1/2$. We will establish the two following estimates:

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\tau} \big|Q_1(\underline{z})\big| \le CN^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)\big(\frac{\nu\log\log\nu}{\log\nu}\big)^{1/2}, \tag{34}$$

and

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\tau} \big|Q_2(\underline{z})\big| \le C\bigg(N^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N/p_\nu)\ \frac{\tau^{1/2}}{(\log\tau)^{1/2}} + \frac{N^{1-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_1(N/p_\nu)}{\nu^{1/2}\log\nu}\bigg). \tag{35}$$

First, evaluate the supremum of Q_2. Writing

$$\begin{aligned} Q_2(\underline{z}) &= \sum_{\nu<j\le\tau} e^{2i\pi z_j} \sum_{n\in E_j} \mu_n d(n) n^{-\sigma} e^{2i\pi\{\sum_{k\neq j} a_k(n)z_k+[a_j(n)-1]z_j\}} \\ &= \sum_{\nu<j\le\tau} e^{2i\pi z_j} \sum_{n\in E_j} \mu_n d(n) n^{-\sigma} e^{2i\pi\left\{\sum_k a_k(\frac{n}{p_j})z_k\right\}} \end{aligned}$$

next developing, gives

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{\nu<j\le\tau} \cos 2\pi z_j \sum_{n\in E_j} \mu_n \frac{d(n)}{n^\sigma}\ \cos 2\pi \sum_k a_k(\frac{n}{p_j})z_k \\ &+i \sum_{\nu<j\le\tau} \sin 2\pi z_j \sum_{n\in E_j} \mu_n \frac{d(n)}{n^\sigma} \cos 2\pi \sum_k a_k(\frac{n}{p_j})z_k \\ &+i \sum_{\nu<j\le\tau} \cos 2\pi z_j \sum_{n\in E_j} \mu_n \frac{d(n)}{n^\sigma} \sin 2\pi \sum_k a_k(\frac{n}{p_j})z_k \\ &- \sum_{\nu<j\le\tau} \sin 2\pi z_j \sum_{n\in E_j} \mu_n \frac{d(n)}{n^\sigma} \sin 2\pi \sum_k a_k(\frac{n}{p_j})z_k \end{aligned}$$

with $n/p_j \le N/p_j < N/p_\nu \le N/2$. Each piece is, up to a factor $1, i, -1$, one of the possible realizations of the random process X defined by

$$X(\gamma) = \sum_{\nu<j\le\tau} \alpha_j \sum_{n\in E_j} \mu_n \frac{d(n)}{n^\sigma} \beta_{\frac{n}{p_j}}, \qquad \gamma\in\Gamma, \tag{36}$$

where $\gamma = \big((\alpha_j)_{\nu<j\le\tau}, (\beta_m)_{1\le m\le N/2}\big)$ and

$$\Gamma = \big\{\gamma : |\alpha_j| \vee |\beta_m| \le 1, \nu < j \le \tau, 1 \le m \le N/2\big\}.$$

Here indeed

$$\alpha_j = \alpha_j(\underline{z}) = \begin{cases} \cos(2\pi z_j), \\ \text{or} \\ \sin(2\pi z_j), \end{cases} \qquad \nu < j \le \tau;$$

and

$$\beta_m = \beta_m(\underline{z}) = \begin{cases} \cos\left(2\pi \sum_k a_k(m)z_k\right), \\ \text{or} \\ \sin\left(2\pi \sum_k a_k(m)z_k\right), \end{cases} \qquad 1 \le m \le \frac{N}{2}.$$

Consequently

$$\sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\tau} \big|Q_2(\underline{z})\big| \le 4 \sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma} \big|X(\gamma)\big|. \tag{37}$$

The problem now reduces to estimating the supremum over Γ of the real valued Gaussian process X. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|X_\gamma - X_{\gamma'}\|_2^2 &= \sum_{\nu<j\le\tau} \sum_{n\in E_j} d(n)^2 n^{-2\sigma} \big[\alpha_j\beta_{\frac{n}{p_j}} - \alpha'_j\beta'_{\frac{n}{p_j}}\big]^2 \\ &\le 2 \sum_{\nu<j\le\tau} \sum_{n\in E_j} d(n)^2 n^{-2\sigma} \big[(\alpha_j - \alpha'_j)^2 + (\beta_{\frac{n}{p_j}} - \beta'_{\frac{n}{p_j}})^2\big]. \end{aligned}$$

As $p_j \mid n$, by condition (10), $d(n) \le \lambda\, d(\frac{n}{p_j})$; and so

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\nu<j\le\tau}\sum_{n\in E_j}\frac{d(n)^2}{n^{2\sigma}}(\alpha_j-\alpha_j')^2 &\le \lambda^2\sum_{\nu<j\le\tau}(\alpha_j-\alpha_j')^2 p_j^{-2\sigma}\sum_{m\le N/p_j}\frac{d(m)^2}{m^{2\sigma}}\\ &\le \lambda^2\sum_{\nu<j\le\tau}(\alpha_j-\alpha_j')^2\frac{N^{1-2\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2^2(N/p_j)}{p_j}, \qquad (38)\end{aligned}$$

where we used estimate (30) of Lemma 7.

Besides, by condition (10) again, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\nu<j\le\tau}\sum_{n\in E_j}\frac{d(n)^2(\beta_{\frac{n}{p_j}}-\beta'_{\frac{n}{p_j}})^2}{n^{2\sigma}} &\le C\lambda^2\sum_{m\le N/p_\nu}(\beta_m-\beta_m')^2\Big(\sum_{\substack{\nu<j\le\tau\\ mp_j\le N}}\frac{d(m)^2}{(mp_j)^{2\sigma}}\Big)\\ &:= C\lambda^2\sum_{m\le N/p_\nu}K_m^2(\beta_m-\beta_m')^2. \qquad (39)\end{aligned}$$

Let $k\in(\nu,\tau]$ be such that $N/p_k < m \le N/p_{k-1}$. Since $p_j\sim j\log j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}K_m^2 &= \sum_{\nu<j\le k-1} d(m)^2(mp_j)^{-2\sigma} \le d(m)^2 m^{-2\sigma}\sum_{j\le k-1}p_j^{-2\sigma}\\ &\le C\ d(m)^2m^{-2\sigma}\sum_{j\le k}(j\log j)^{-2\sigma}\le C\ d(m)^2m^{-2\sigma}\ \frac{k^{1-2\sigma}}{(\log k)^{2\sigma}}\\ &\le Cd(m)^2m^{-2\sigma}\ \frac{k}{p_k^{2\sigma}}\le Cm^{-2\sigma}d(m)^2\ \frac{k}{(N/m)^{2\sigma}}\\ &= C\ d(m)^2\frac{k}{N^{2\sigma}}\ .\end{aligned}$$

We have $k\log k\le Cp_k \le C\ \frac{N}{m}$, and so $k\le C\ \frac{N}{m}\ (\log(\frac{N}{m}))^{-1}$. Thus

$$K_m \le C\ d(m)N^{-\sigma}(\frac{N}{m})^{1/2}\ (\log(\frac{N}{m}))^{-1/2}\ . \qquad (40)$$

By using estimate (31) of Lemma 7

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{m\le N/p_\nu}K_m &\le C\ N^{-\sigma}\sum_{m\le N/p_\nu}(\frac{N}{m})^{1/2}\ (\log(\frac{N}{m}))^{-1/2}d(m)\\ &\le \frac{CN^{1-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_1(N/p_\nu)}{\nu^{1/2}\log\nu}\ . \qquad (41)\end{aligned}$$

Now define a second Gaussian process by putting for all $\gamma\in\Gamma$

$$Y(\gamma)=\sum_{\nu<j\le\tau}\Big(\frac{\widetilde{D}_2^2(N/p_j)N^{1-2\sigma}}{p_j}\Big)^{1/2}\alpha_j\xi_j' + \sum_{m\le N/p_\nu}K_m\ \beta_m\xi_m'' := \ Y_\gamma' + Y_\gamma'',$$

where ξ_i', ξ_j'' are independent $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ random variables. It follows from (38) and (39) that for some suitable constant C, one has the comparison relations: for all $\gamma,\gamma'\in\Gamma$,

$$\|X_\gamma - X_{\gamma'}\|_2 \le C\|Y_\gamma - Y_{\gamma'}\|_2.$$

By the Slepian comparison lemma ([7], Theorem 4 p.190), since $X_0 = Y_0 = 0$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma}|X_\gamma| \le 2\mathbf{E}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma}X_\gamma \le 2C\mathbf{E}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma}Y_\gamma \le 2C\mathbf{E}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma}|Y_\gamma|. \tag{42}$$

And with (37)

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\tau}\big|Q_2(\underline{z})\big| \le C\mathbf{E}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma}\big|Y(\gamma)\big|. \tag{43}$$

It remains to evaluate the supremum of Y. First of all,

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma}|Y'(\gamma)| \le N^{\frac12-\sigma}\sum_{\nu<j\le\tau}p_j^{-1/2}\widetilde{D}_2(N/p_j).$$

As $p_j \sim j\log j$, we have

$$\sum_{\nu<j\le\tau}p_j^{-1/2} \le \sum_{1<j\le\tau}p_j^{-1/2} \le \frac{C\tau^{1/2}}{(\log\tau)^{1/2}}\ ,$$

thus

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma}|Y'(\gamma)| \le C\ N^{\frac12-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N/p_\nu)\ \frac{\tau^{1/2}}{(\log\tau)^{1/2}}\ . \tag{44}$$

To control the supremum of Y'', we use our estimates for the sums of K_m and write that

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\gamma\in\Gamma}|Y''(\gamma)| \le \sum_{m\le N/p_\nu}K_m \le \frac{CN^{1-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_1(N/p_\nu)}{\nu^{1/2}\log\nu}\ . \tag{45}$$

Therefore by reporting (44), (45) into (43), we get (35).

Now, we turn to the supremum of Q_1. Introduce the auxiliary Gaussian process

$$\Upsilon(\underline{z}) = \sum_{n\in F_\nu}d(n)n^{-\sigma}\big\{\vartheta_n\cos2\pi\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle + \vartheta'_n\sin2\pi\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle\big\}, \qquad \underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\nu,$$

where ϑ_i, ϑ'_j are independent $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ random variables. By symmetrization (see e.g. Lemma 2.3 p. 269 in [10]),

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\nu}\big|Q_1(\underline{z})\big| \le \sqrt{8\pi}\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\nu}\big|\Upsilon(\underline{z})\big|. \tag{46}$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned}\big\|\Upsilon(\underline{z})-\Upsilon(\underline{z})\big\|_2^2 &= 4\sum_{n\in F_\nu}\frac{d(n)^2}{n^{2\sigma}}\sin^2(\pi\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}-\underline{z}'\rangle)\\ &\le 4\pi^2\sum_{n\in F_\nu}\frac{d(n)^2}{n^{2\sigma}}|\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}-\underline{z}'\rangle|^2\\ &\le 4\pi^2\sum_{n\in F_\nu}\frac{d(n)^2}{n^{2\sigma}}\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{\nu}a_j(n)|z_j-z'_j|\Big]^2.\end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\sum_{n\in F_\nu}\frac{d(n)^2}{n^{2\sigma}}\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{\nu}a_j(n)|z_j-z_j'|\Big]^2=\sum_{j=1}^{\nu}|z_j-z_j'|^2\sum_{n\in F_\nu}\frac{a_j(n)^2d(n)^2}{n^{2\sigma}}$$

$$+\sum_{\substack{1\le j_1,j_2\le\nu\\ j_1\neq j_2}}|z_{j_1}-z'_{j_1}|\;|z_{j_2}-z'_{j_2}|\sum_{n\in F_\nu}\frac{a_{j_1}(n)a_{j_2}(n)d(n)^2}{n^{2\sigma}}:=S+R.$$

Examine first the contribution of the rectangle terms. Only those integers n such that $a_{j_1}(n)\ge 1$ and $a_{j_2}(n)\ge 1$ are to be considered. Using submultiplicativity, we have

$$\begin{aligned}R &\le \sum_{\substack{1\le j_1,j_2\le\nu\\ j_1\neq j_2}}|z_{j_1}-z'_{j_1}|\;|z_{j_2}-z'_{j_2}|\sum_{b_1,b_2=1}^{\infty}b_1b_2\sum_{\substack{n\le N,a_{j_1}(n)=b_1,\\ a_{j_2}(n)=b_2}}\frac{d(n)^2}{n^{2\sigma}}\\ &\le C\sum_{\substack{1\le j_1,j_2\le\nu\\ j_1\neq j_2}}|z_{j_1}-z'_{j_1}||z_{j_2}-z'_{j_2}|\sum_{b_1,b_2=1}^{\infty}\frac{b_1d(p_{j_1}^{b_1})^2}{p_{j_1}^{2b_1\sigma}}\frac{b_2d(p_{j_2}^{b_2})^2}{p_{j_2}^{2b_2\sigma}}\\ &\qquad\times\Big[\sum_{k\le\frac{N}{p_{j_1}^{b_1}p_{j_2}^{b_2}}}\frac{d(k)^2}{k^{2\sigma}}\Big].\end{aligned}\tag{47}$$

Examine now the contribution of the square terms. We have

$$\begin{aligned}S &\le \sum_{j=1}^{\nu}|z_j-z_j'|^2\sum_{b=1}^{\infty}\sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu\\ a_j(n)=b}}\frac{b^2d(n)^2}{n^{2\sigma}}\\ &\le \sum_{j=1}^{\nu}|z_j-z_j'|^2\sum_{b=1}^{\infty}\frac{b^2d(p_j^b)^2}{p_j^{2b\sigma}}\sum_{m\le\frac{N}{p_j^b}}\frac{d(m)^2}{m^{2\sigma}}.\end{aligned}\tag{48}$$

By estimate (32) of Lemma 7, we have

$$\sum_{k\le\frac{N}{p_{j_1}^{b_1}p_{j_2}^{b_2}}}\frac{d(k)^2}{k^{2\sigma}}\le C\widetilde{D}_2(N)^2\Big[\frac{N}{p_{j_1}^{b_1}p_{j_2}^{b_2}}\Big]^{1-2\sigma}.\tag{49}$$

Hence

$$R\le C\widetilde{D}_2(N)^2\sum_{\substack{1\le j_1,j_2\le\nu\\ j_1\neq j_2}}|z_{j_1}-z'_{j_1}||z_{j_2}-z'_{j_2}|\sum_{b_1,b_2=1}^{\infty}\frac{b_1d(p_{j_1}^{b_1})^2}{p_{j_1}^{2b_1\sigma}}\frac{b_2d(p_{j_2}^{b_2})^2}{p_{j_2}^{2b_2\sigma}}\Big[\frac{N}{p_{j_1}^{b_1}p_{j_2}^{b_2}}\Big]^{1-2\sigma}$$

$$=C\widetilde{D}_2(N)^2N^{1-2\sigma}\sum_{\substack{1\le j_1,j_2\le\nu\\ j_1\neq j_2}}|z_{j_1}-z'_{j_1}||z_{j_2}-z'_{j_2}|\sum_{b_1,b_2=1}^{\infty}\frac{b_1d(p_{j_1}^{b_1})^2}{p_{j_1}^{b_1}}\frac{b_2d(p_{j_2}^{b_2})^2}{p_{j_2}^{b_2}}.$$

But, by condition (10)

$$\sum_{b\ge1}b\frac{d(p_j^b)^2}{p_j^b}\quad\le\quad C\sum_{b\ge1}b\left(\frac{\lambda^2}{2}\right)^b\left(\frac{2}{p_j}\right)^b\le C\left(\frac{2}{p_j}\right)\sum_{b\ge1}b\left(\frac{\lambda^2}{2}\right)^b$$

$$\leq \frac{C_\lambda}{p_j}. \tag{50}$$

From this follows that

$$R \leq C_\lambda \widetilde{D}_2(N)^2 N^{1-2\sigma} \Big[\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|}{p_j}\Big]^2. \tag{51}$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq C\widetilde{D}_2(N)^2 \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} |z_j - z_j'|^2 \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \frac{b^2 d(p_j^b)^2}{p_j^{2b\sigma}} \Big[\frac{N}{p_j^b}\Big]^{1-2\sigma} \\ &\leq C\widetilde{D}_2(N)^2 N^{1-2\sigma} \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} |z_j - z_j'|^2 \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \frac{b^2 d(p_j^b)^2}{p_j^b} \\ &\leq C\widetilde{D}_2(N)^2 N^{1-2\sigma} \Big[\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|^2}{p_j}\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

by arguing as in (50) for getting the last inequality.

Consequently

$$\big\|\Upsilon(\underline{z}) - \Upsilon(\underline{z})\big\|_2 \leq C_\lambda N^{1/2-\sigma} \widetilde{D}_2(N) \max\bigg(\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|}{p_j}, \Big[\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|^2}{p_j}\Big]^{1/2}\bigg). \tag{53}$$

We shall control the Gaussian process Υ in a more simple and more efficient way than in [8],[9]. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|}{p_j} &\leq \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|^2}{p_j}\Big)^{1/2} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{1}{p_j}\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|^2}{p_j}\Big)^{1/2} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{1}{j \log j}\Big)^{1/2} \\ &\leq (\log\log \nu)^{1/2} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|^2}{p_j}\Big)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Therefore

$$\big\|\Upsilon(\underline{z}) - \Upsilon(\underline{z})\big\|_2 \leq C_\lambda N^{1/2-\sigma} \widetilde{D}_2(N) (\log\log \nu)^{1/2} \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|^2}{p_j}\Big)^{1/2}. \tag{55}$$

A Gaussian metric appears: let indeed $g_1, \ldots, g_\nu$ be independent $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ distributed random variables. Then $U(z) := \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} g_j p_j^{-1/2} z_j$ satisfies

$$\|U(z) - U(z')\|_2 = \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\nu} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|^2}{p_j}\Big)^{1/2}.$$

And so

$$\big\|\Upsilon(\underline{z}) - \Upsilon(\underline{z})\big\|_2 \leq C_\lambda N^{1/2-\sigma} \widetilde{D}_2(N) (\log\log \nu)^{1/2} \|U(z) - U(z')\|_2. \tag{56}$$

Now we take again advantage of the comparison properties of Gaussian processes, and deduce from Slepian's Lemma

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z},\underline{z}'\in T^\nu}|\Upsilon(\underline{z}')-\Upsilon(\underline{z})|\le C_\lambda N^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)(\log\log\nu)^{1/2}\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z},\underline{z}'\in T^\nu}|U(\underline{z}')-U(\underline{z})|.$$

But obviously

$$\sup_{\underline{z}\in T^\nu}|U(z)|=\sum_{j=1}^{\nu}|g_j|p_j^{-1/2}.$$

Thereby

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}'\in T^\nu}|U(\underline{z}')-U(\underline{z})|\le C\sum_{j=1}^{\nu}p_j^{-1/2}\le C\sum_{j=1}^{\nu}\frac{1}{(j\log j)^{1/2}}\le C\big(\frac{\nu}{\log\nu}\big)^{1/2}.$$

And by reporting

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}'\in T^\nu}|\Upsilon(\underline{z}')-\Upsilon(\underline{z})|\le C_\lambda N^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)\big(\frac{\nu\log\log\nu}{\log\nu}\big)^{1/2}.$$

Observe also that

$$\|\Upsilon(\underline{z})\|_2\le CN^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N),\quad \underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\nu. \tag{57}$$

Thus

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}'\in T^\nu}|\Upsilon(\underline{z}')|\le CN^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)\big(\frac{\nu\log\log\nu}{\log\nu}\big)^{1/2}. \tag{58}$$

This is slightly better than in [9], inequality (22), where one has the bound $CN^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)\nu^{1/2}$. By substituting in (46) we get

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\nu}\big|Q_1(\underline{z})\big|\le C_{\sigma,\lambda}\,N^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)\big(\frac{\nu\log\log\nu}{\log\nu}\big)^{1/2}, \tag{59}$$

which is (34).

Since $\widetilde{D}_1(N/p_\nu)\le\widetilde{D}_2(N/p_\nu)\le\widetilde{D}_2(N)$, we consequently get from (34),(35) and (28),

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}|\mathcal{D}(\sigma+it)|\le C_{\sigma,\lambda}\,N^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)\,\Big[\big(\frac{\nu\log\log\nu}{\log\nu}\big)^{1/2}+\frac{\tau^{1/2}}{(\log\tau)^{1/2}}+\frac{N^{1/2}}{\nu^{1/2}\log\nu}\Big]. \tag{60}$$

We now observe that $f(x):=(x\log\log x)^{1/2}(\log x)^{-1/2}+N^{1/2}x^{-1/2}(\log x)^{-1}$ satisfies

$$f'(x)\sim\frac{1}{2}x^{-1/2}(\log x)^{-1/2}\big[(\log\log x)^{1/2}-N^{1/2}x^{-1}(\log x)^{-1/2}\big].$$

Thus we choose

$$\nu\sim\frac{N^{1/2}}{(\log\log N)^{1/2}(\log N)^{1/2}}.$$

We get

$$\frac{N^{1/2}}{\nu^{1/2}\log\nu}\approx\frac{N^{1/4}(\log\log N)^{1/4}}{(\log N)^{3/4}}\approx\Big(\frac{\nu\log\log\nu}{\log\nu}\Big)^{1/2}.$$

We find

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}|\mathcal{D}(\sigma+it)|\le C_{\sigma,\lambda}\,N^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)\left[\frac{N^{1/4}(\log\log N)^{1/4}}{(\log N)^{3/4}}+\frac{\tau^{1/2}}{(\log\tau)^{1/2}}\right].\tag{61}$$

We also observe that $\frac{N^{1/4}(\log\log N)^{1/4}}{(\log N)^{3/4}}\le\frac{\tau^{1/2}}{(\log\tau)^{1/2}}$, iff $\tau\ge(\frac{N\log\log N}{\log N})^{1/2}$. Further when $\tau\le(\frac{N\log\log N}{\log N})^{1/2}$, we may also just set $\nu=\tau$ in the initial decomposition, and thus ignore Q_2^ε. It means that we use the bound (59) in place of (60). This makes sense when τ is sufficiently small, namely when $(\frac{\tau\log\log\tau}{\log\tau})^{1/2}\le\frac{N^{1/4}(\log\log N)^{1/4}}{(\log N)^{3/4}}$; which is so when $\tau\le(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N})^{1/2}$. We consequently have to distinguish three cases.

Case 1. $\big(\frac{N\log\log N}{\log N}\big)^{1/2}\le\tau\le\pi(N)$. We get from (61)

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}|\mathcal{D}(\sigma+it)|\le C_{\sigma,\lambda}\frac{N^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)\tau^{1/2}}{(\log N)^{1/2}}.\tag{62}$$

Case 2. $\big(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N}\big)^{1/2}\le\tau\le\big(\frac{N\log\log N}{\log N}\big)^{1/2}$. In this case we obtain from (61)

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}|\mathcal{D}(\sigma+it)|\le C_{\sigma,\lambda}\frac{N^{3/4-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)(\log\log N)^{1/4}}{(\log N)^{3/4}}.\tag{63}$$

Case 3. $1\le\tau\le\big(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N}\big)^{1/2}$. By the comment made above, τ is small enough, and we forget Q_2^ε. We obtain from (59) directly

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}|\mathcal{D}(\sigma+it)|\le C_{\sigma,\lambda}\,N^{1/2-\sigma}\widetilde{D}_2(N)\,\big(\frac{\tau\log\log\tau}{\log\tau}\big)^{1/2}.\tag{64}$$

Summarizing

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}|\mathcal{D}(\sigma+it)|\le C_{\sigma,\lambda}\,\widetilde{D}_2(N)\,B,$$

where

$$B=\begin{cases}\frac{N^{1/2-\sigma}\tau^{1/2}}{(\log N)^{1/2}} & \text{, if }\ \big(\frac{N\log\log N}{\log N}\big)^{1/2}\le\tau\le\pi(N),\\ \frac{N^{3/4-\sigma}(\log\log N)^{1/4}}{(\log N)^{3/4}} & \text{, if }\ \big(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N}\big)^{1/2}\le\tau\le\big(\frac{N\log\log N}{\log N}\big)^{1/2},\\ N^{1/2-\sigma}\big(\frac{\tau\log\log\tau}{\log\tau}\big)^{1/2} & \text{, if }\ 1\le\tau\le\big(\frac{N}{(\log N)\log\log N}\big)^{1/2}.\end{cases}$$

This achieves the proof. ■

3 Proof of Theorem 5.

We examine more specifically the increments of the Gaussian process Υ. There is no loss to assume

$$p\mid K\quad\Rightarrow\quad p\le p_\nu.$$

We have here

$$\Upsilon(\underline{z}) \quad = \quad \sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu \\ (n,K)=1}} n^{-\sigma}\big\{\vartheta_n \cos 2\pi\langle \underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle + \vartheta'_n \sin 2\pi\langle \underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle\big\}. \tag{65}$$

And, as $(n,K)=1$ iff $a_\ell(n)>0 \ \Rightarrow\ (p_\ell,K)=1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \big\|\Upsilon(\underline{z})-\Upsilon(\underline{z})\big\|_2^2 \quad &= \quad 4\sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu \\ (n,K)=1}} n^{-2\sigma}\sin^2(\pi\langle \underline{a}(n),\underline{z}-\underline{z}'\rangle) \\ &\le \quad 4\pi^2 \sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu \\ (n,K)=1}} n^{-2\sigma}\Big[\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu \\ (p_j,K)=1}} a_j(n)|z_j-z'_j|\Big]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu \\ (n,K)=1}} n^{-2\sigma}\Big[\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu \\ (p_j,K)=1}} a_j(n)|z_j-z'_j|\Big]^2 &= \sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu \\ (n,K)=1}} n^{-2\sigma} \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu \\ (p_j,K)=1}} a_j(n)^2|z_j-z'_j|^2 \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu \\ (n,K)=1}} n^{-2\sigma} \sum_{\substack{1\le j_1\neq j_2\le \nu \\ (p_{j_1}p_{j_2},K)=1}} a_{j_1}(n)a_{j_2}(n)|z_{j_1}-z'_{j_1}|\ |z_{j_2}-z'_{j_2}| := S+R. \end{aligned}$$

Further

$$\begin{aligned} R \quad &\le \quad \sum_{\substack{1\le j_1\neq j_2\le \nu \\ (p_{j_1}p_{j_2},K)=1}} |z_{j_1}-z'_{j_1}|\ |z_{j_2}-z'_{j_2}| \sum_{b_1,b_2=1}^{\infty} b_1b_2 \sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu,\,(n,K)=1 \\ a_{j_1}(n)=b_1,\,a_{j_2}(n)=b_2}} \frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}} \\ &\le \quad C \sum_{\substack{1\le j_1\neq j_2\le \nu \\ (p_{j_1}p_{j_2},K)=1}} |z_{j_1}-z'_{j_1}||z_{j_2}-z'_{j_2}| \sum_{b_1,b_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_1b_2}{(p_{j_1}^{b_1}p_{j_2}^{b_2})^{2\sigma}} \\ &\qquad \times\Big[\sum_{m\le N/(p_{j_1}^{b_1}p_{j_2}^{b_2})} m^{-2\sigma}\Big] \\ &\le \quad CN^{1-2\sigma} \sum_{\substack{1\le j_1\neq j_2\le \nu \\ (p_{j_1}p_{j_2},K)=1}} |z_{j_1}-z'_{j_1}||z_{j_2}-z'_{j_2}| \sum_{b_1,b_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{b_1b_2}{p_{j_1}^{b_1}p_{j_2}^{b_2}}. \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

But

$$\sum_{b=1}^{\infty}\frac{b}{p_k^b} = \sum_{b=1}^{\infty}\frac{b}{2^b}\Big[\frac{2}{p_k}\Big]^b \le \frac{2}{p_k}\sum_{b=1}^{\infty}\frac{b}{2^b} \le Cp_k^{-1}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} R \quad &\le \quad CN^{1-2\sigma}\Big(\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu \\ (p_j,K)=1}} \frac{|z_j-z'_j|}{p_j}\Big)^2 \\ &\le \quad CN^{1-2\sigma}\Big(\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu \\ (p_j,K)=1}} \frac{1}{p_j}\Big)\Big(\sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu \\ (p_j,K)=1}} \frac{|z_j-z'_j|^2}{p_j}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

And

$$S \quad \le \quad \sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu \\ (n,K)=1}} n^{-2\sigma} \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu \\ (p_j,K)=1}} a_j(n)^2|z_j-z'_j|^2$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\le \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu\\ (p_j,K)=1}} |z_j - z_j'|^2 \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} b^2 \sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu\\ (n,K)=1\\ a_j(n)=b}} \frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}}\\
&\le \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu\\ (p_j,K)=1}} |z_j - z_j'|^2 \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \frac{b^2}{p_j^{2b\sigma}} \sum_{m\le N/p_j^b} \frac{1}{m^{2\sigma}}\\
&\le \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu\\ (p_j,K)=1}} |z_j - z_j'|^2 \sum_{b=1}^{\infty} \frac{b^2}{p_j^{b}} \le \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu\\ (p_j,K)=1}} \frac{|z_j - z_j'|^2}{p_j}. \qquad (68)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\big\|\Upsilon(\underline{z}) - \Upsilon(\underline{z})\big\|_2^2 \le C_\sigma N^{1-2\sigma} \Big[\sum_{\substack{k\le \nu\\ p_k\nmid K}} \frac{|z_k - z_k'|^2}{p_k}\Big] \max\Big(1, \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu\\ (p_j,K)=1}} \frac{1}{p_j}\Big). \qquad (69)$$

Let

$$\Delta := N^{1/2-\sigma} \max\Big(1, \sum_{\substack{1\le j\le \nu\\ (p_j,K)=1}} \frac{1}{p_j}\Big)^{1/2}.$$

We obtain

$$\big\|\Upsilon(\underline{z}) - \Upsilon(\underline{z})\big\|_2 \le C_\sigma \Delta \Big[\sum_{\substack{k\le \nu\\ p_k\nmid K}} \frac{|z_k - z_k'|^2}{p_k}\Big]^{1/2}. \qquad (70)$$

Let $g_1, \dots, g_\nu$ be independent $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ distributed random variables and define $U(z) := \sum_{\substack{k\le \nu\\ p_k\nmid K}} g_k p_k^{-1/2} z_k$. Then

$$\big\|\Upsilon(\underline{z}) - \Upsilon(\underline{z})\big\|_2 \le C_\sigma \Delta \|U(z) - U(z')\|_2. \qquad (71)$$

We deduce from Slepian's Lemma

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z}'\in T^\nu} |\Upsilon(\underline{z}') - \Upsilon(\underline{z})| \le C_\sigma \Delta \mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z}'\in T^\nu} |U(\underline{z}') - U(\underline{z})|.$$

Obviously

$$\sup_{\underline{z}\in T^\nu} |U(z)| = \sum_{\substack{k\le \nu\\ p_k\nmid K}} \frac{|g_k|}{p_k^{1/2}}.$$

Thereby

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z}'\in T^\nu} |U(\underline{z}') - U(\underline{z})| \le C \sum_{\substack{k\le \nu\\ p_k\nmid K}} p_k^{-1/2}.$$

And by reporting

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z}'\in T^\nu} |\Upsilon(\underline{z}') - \Upsilon(\underline{z})| \le C_\sigma \Delta \Big[\sum_{\substack{k\le \nu\\ p_k\nmid K}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_k}}\Big].$$

But

$$\|\Upsilon(\underline{z})\|_2 \le \Big[\sum_{\substack{n\in F_\nu\\ (n,K)=1}} \frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}}\Big]^{1/2} \le C_\sigma N^{1/2-\sigma} \Big[\sum_{\substack{k\le \nu\\ p_k\nmid K}} \frac{1}{p_j}\Big]^{1/2}, \qquad \underline{z} \in \mathbf{T}^\nu. \qquad (72)$$

Thus

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}'\in T^\nu}|\Upsilon(\underline{z}')|\le C_\sigma\Delta\Big[\sum_{\substack{k\le\nu\\ p_k\nmid K}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_k}}\Big], \tag{73}$$

or

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}'\in T^\nu}|\Upsilon(\underline{z}')|\le N^{1/2-\sigma}\ \max\Big(1,\sum_{\substack{k\le\nu\\ p_k\nmid K}}\frac{1}{p_k}\Big)^{1/2}\Big[\sum_{\substack{k\le\nu\\ p_k\nmid K}}\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_k}}\Big]. \tag{74}$$

∎

4 Intermediate results.

The following result of Hall will be useful. Let f be defined on positive integers and satisfying $f(1)=1$, $0\le f(n)\le 1$, and being sub-multiplicative.

Put

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_x(f)=\prod_{p\le x}\Big(1-\frac{1}{p}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{f(p)}{p}+\frac{f(p^2)}{p^2}+\dots\Big)$$

Then ([2], theorem 2)

$$\sum_{n\le x}f(n)\le C\ x\mathbf{\Pi}_x(f), \tag{75}$$

C being an absolute constant. This estimate allows in turn a similar control for bounded non-negative sub-multiplicative functions.

Apply it to $f=d_K$. As $1+\frac{f(p)}{p}+\frac{f(p^2)}{p^2}+\dots=\frac{p}{p-1}$, if $(p,K)=1$, we have

$$\mathbf{\Pi}_x(f)=\prod_{\substack{p\le x\\ (p,K)>1}}\big(1-\frac{1}{p}\big)=\prod_{\substack{p\le x\\ p|K}}\big(1-\frac{1}{p}\big). \tag{76}$$

Hence the classical estimate, (see [2] for references)

$$\varphi_K(x):=\#\big\{k\le x:(k,K)=1\big\}\le C\ x\prod_{\substack{p|K\\ p\le x}}\big(1-\frac{1}{p}\big). \tag{77}$$

We will need the following technical Lemma.

Lemma 8 *a) Let a real $\beta>0$ and integer $L>0$. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{(n,L)=1\\ n\le x}}n^{-\beta}\le C_\beta x^{1-\beta}\prod_{\substack{p|L\\ p\le x}}\big(1-\frac{1}{p}\big). \tag{78}$$

b) Let $0\le\beta<1$. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}}\frac{1}{n^\beta}\le C_\beta x^{1-\beta}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\log x}{\log y}}, \tag{79}$$

for some constant C_β, $y\ge y_\beta$, $y/x\le c_\beta$.

c) If $\beta = 1$, then

$$\sum_{\substack{y \le n \le x \\ P^+(n) \le y}} \frac{1}{n} \le C \log y. \tag{80}$$

Remark 9 It is natural to compare, in our setting, estimates a) anf b), via the relation

$$\sum_{\substack{P^+(n) \le p_\tau \\ n \le N}} \frac{1}{n^\beta} = \sum_{\substack{(n, K_\tau)=1 \\ n \le N}} n^{-\beta}$$

where K_τ is defined in (20). By a) and Mertens Theorem we get

$$\sum_{\substack{P^+(n) \le p_\tau \\ n \le N}} \frac{1}{n^\beta} \le C_\beta N^{1-\beta} \prod_{\tau < \ell \le \pi(N)} (1 - \frac{1}{p}) \le C_\beta N^{1-\beta} \frac{\log p_\tau}{\log N}.$$

However, by using b) we get the much better bound $C_\beta N^{1-\beta} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\log N}{\log p_\nu}}$.

Proof. a) By applying formula (29) with $a_m = \chi\{(m, L) = 1\}$, $b_m = m^{-\sigma}$, $1 \le m \le x$,

$$\sum_{\substack{(m,L)=1 \\ m \le x}} m^{-\beta} \le \frac{A(x)}{x^\beta} + \beta \int_1^x A(t) \frac{dt}{t^{\beta+1}},$$

where $A(t) = \sum_{n<t} d_L(n)$.

But by Hall's estimate (77), $A(t) \le Ct \prod_{\substack{p|L \\ p \le t}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)$. Thus

$$\sum_{\substack{(m,L)=1 \\ m \le x}} m^{-\beta} \le Cx \prod_{\substack{p|L \\ p \le x}} (1 - \frac{1}{p}) \frac{1}{x^\beta} + C\beta \int_1^x \prod_{\substack{p|L \\ p \le t}} (1 - \frac{1}{p}) \frac{dt}{t^\beta} \le C_\beta \int_1^x \prod_{\substack{p|L \\ p \le t}} (1 - \frac{1}{p}) \frac{dt}{t^\beta}.$$

Applying now twice Mertens's theorem, gives

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\substack{p|L \\ p \le t}} (1 - \frac{1}{p}) &= \frac{\prod_{p \le t} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)}{\prod_{\substack{p \nmid L \\ p \le t}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)} \le \frac{C}{\log t \prod_{\substack{p \nmid L \\ p \le x}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)} \le \frac{C \prod_{\substack{p|L \\ p \le x}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)}{\log t \prod_{p \le x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)} \\ &\le C \frac{\log x}{\log t} \prod_{\substack{p|L \\ p \le x}} (1 - \frac{1}{p}). \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

Hence

$$\sum_{\substack{(m,L)=1 \\ m \le x}} m^{-\beta} \le C_\beta \log x \prod_{\substack{p|L \\ p \le x}} (1 - \frac{1}{p}) \int_1^x \frac{dt}{t^\beta \log t} \le C_\beta x^{1-\beta} \prod_{\substack{p|L \\ p \le x}} (1 - \frac{1}{p}).$$

b) Let $\Psi(x, y) := \#\{n \le x : P^+(n) \le y\}$. By using this time (29) with $a_n = \chi\{P^+(n) \le y\}$ $1 \le n \le N$, we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \le n \le x \\ P^+(n) \le y}} \frac{1}{n^\beta} = \frac{\#\{1 \le n \le x : P^+(n) \le y\}}{x^\beta} + \beta \int_1^x \frac{\#\{1 \le n \le t : P^+(n) \le y\}}{t^{\beta+1}} dt$$

$$= \quad \frac{\Psi(x,y)}{x^\beta} + \beta\int_1^y \frac{dt}{t^\beta} + \beta\int_y^x \frac{\Psi(t,y)}{t^{\beta+1}}\,dt. \tag{82}$$

Recall that $\Psi(x,y) \le xe^{-\frac12 \frac{\log x}{\log y}}$, $x \ge y \ge 2$, ([12], Chapter III.5). Thus, for y sufficiently large to have $1-\beta > \frac{1}{\log y}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_y^x \frac{\Psi(t,y)}{t^{\beta+1}}\,dt &\le \int_y^x e^{-\frac12\frac{\log t}{\log y}}\frac{dt}{t^\beta} = \int_y^x t^{-\frac{1}{2\log y}-\beta}\,dt \\
&= \frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{2\log y}-\beta}\,\Big(t^{1-\frac{1}{2\log y}-\beta}\Big|_{t=y}^{t=x} \le \frac{2}{1-\beta}\,x^{1-\frac{1}{2\log y}-\beta} \\
&= \frac{2}{1-\beta}\,x^{1-\beta}e^{-\frac12\frac{\log x}{\log y}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{\substack{y\le n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n^\beta} \quad\le\quad C_\beta\Big[x^{1-\beta}e^{-\frac12\frac{\log x}{\log y}} + y^{1-\beta}\Big]. \tag{84}$$

Now, we have $x^{1-\beta}e^{-\frac12\frac{\log x}{\log y}} \ge y^{1-\beta}$ iff $\log\frac{x}{y} \ge \frac{1}{2(1-\beta)}\,\frac{\log x}{\log y}$. Write $x=\theta y$, $\theta\ge 1$. This means

$$\log\theta \ge \frac{1}{2(1-\beta)}\,\frac{\log\theta y}{\log y} = \frac{1}{2(1-\beta)}\,\Big\{\frac{\log\theta}{\log y}+1\Big\},$$

or

$$\log\theta\Big\{1-\frac{1}{2(1-\beta)\log y}\Big\} \ge \frac{1}{2(1-\beta)}.$$

If y is large enough, $y\ge y_\beta$, y/x small enough, $y\le c_\beta x$, then the above condition is satisfied. Consequently

$$\sum_{\substack{n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n^\beta} \le C_\beta x^{1-\beta}e^{-\frac12\frac{\log x}{\log y}}. \tag{85}$$

c) The case $\beta=1$ can be treated as before:

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n} \quad=\quad \frac{\Psi(x,y)}{x} + \int_1^y \frac{dt}{t} + \int_y^x \frac{\Psi(t,y)}{t}\,dt. \tag{86}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_y^x \frac{\Psi(t,y)}{t^2}\,dt &\le \int_y^x e^{-\frac12\frac{\log t}{\log y}}\frac{dt}{t} = \int_y^x t^{-\frac{1}{2\log y}-1}\,dt = \frac{1}{-\frac{1}{2\log y}}\,\Big[t^{-\frac{1}{2\log y}}\Big|_{t=y}^{t=x} \\
&\le \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2\log y}}\,y^{-\frac{1}{2\log y}} \le C\log y.
\end{aligned} \tag{87}$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{\substack{y\le n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n} \quad\le\quad C\Big[e^{-\frac12\frac{\log x}{\log y}} + \log y\Big] \le C\log y. \tag{88}$$

One can however get this directly. Let $j = j_y = \max\{\ell : p_\ell \le y\}$. Then, for any $\beta > 0$,

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n^\beta} \le \sum_{\alpha_1=0}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{\alpha_j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p_1^{\alpha_1\beta}\ldots p_j^{\alpha_j\beta}} = \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big(\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^\beta}}\Big). \tag{89}$$

And when $\beta = 1$, by Mertens Theorem, the latter is less than $\le C\log y$. ■

This last argument can serve to get a two-sided estimate when y is not too large. In this case, the estimates depend on y only.

Lemma 10 *If $y = o(\log x)$, then we have for any $\beta > 0$,*

$$c_\beta \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^\beta}}\Big] \le \sum_{\substack{1\le n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n^\beta} \le C_\beta \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^\beta}}\Big]. \tag{90}$$

And the involved constants c_β, C_β depend on β only. In particular

$$C_1 \log y \le \sum_{\substack{1\le n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n} \le C_2 \log y. \tag{91}$$

Proof. Indeed, notice first, as $p_j \sim j\log j$, that we have $j \le Cy/\log y$. Now consider integers $n = p_1^{\alpha_1}\ldots p_j^{\alpha_j}$, such that $\max\{\alpha_\ell, \ell \le j\} \le H := (\log x)/Cy$. Thus

$$n \le y^{j\max\{\alpha_\ell,\ell\le j\}} = e^{j(\log y)\max\{\alpha_\ell,\ell\le j\}} \le e^{\frac{Cy}{\log y}(\log y)\{\frac{\log x}{Cy}\}} \le x.$$

We may also assume that $(H+1)\beta \ge 2$. Therefore

$$\sum_{\substack{1\le n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n^\beta} \ge \sum_{\alpha_1=0}^{H} \cdots \sum_{\alpha_j=0}^{H} \frac{1}{p_1^{\alpha_1\beta}\ldots p_j^{\alpha_j\beta}} = \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^\beta}} - \sum_{\alpha_j=H+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p_\ell^{\alpha_\ell\beta}}\Big]$$

$$= \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^\beta}}\Big] \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big[1 - \frac{1}{p_\ell^{(H+1)\beta}}\Big] \ge c_\beta \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^\beta}}\Big].$$

But

$$\prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big[1 - \frac{1}{p_\ell^{(H+1)\beta}}\Big] \ge \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big[1 - \frac{1}{p_\ell^2}\Big] \ge e^{-C'\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} p_\ell^{-2}} > 0.$$

since the series $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} p_\ell^{-2}$ is obviously convergent. And so, in view of (89)

$$c_\beta \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^\beta}}\Big] \le \sum_{\substack{1\le n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n^\beta} \le C_\beta \prod_{\ell=1}^{j} \Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^\beta}}\Big]. \tag{92}$$

When $\beta = 1$, by using Mertens Theorem

$$C_1 \log y \le \sum_{\substack{1\le n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n} \le C_2 \log y.$$

■

We continue with some other useful observations.

Remark 11 Let $u := \frac{\log x}{\log y}$ and $\rho(.)$ denote Dickman's function. According to ([12], p.435),

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{n\le x\\ P^+(n)\le y}} \frac{1}{n} &= \log y\int_0^u \rho(v)dv + \mathcal{O}(u) = \log y\Big(e^\gamma + \mathcal{O}\big(\frac{u}{\log y} + e^{-u/2}\big)\Big) + \mathcal{O}(u)\\ &= e^\gamma \log y + \mathcal{O}(u), \qquad (93)\end{aligned}$$

for $x \ge y \ge 2$, γ being Euler's constant.

In [8], we introduced a new approach to lower bounds. It will be necessary to briefly recall its principle. We begin with the lemma below ([8], Lemma 3.1).

Lemma 12 *Let $X = \{X_z, z\in Z\}$ and $Y = \{Y_z, z \in Z\}$ be two finite sets of random variables defined on a common probability space. We assume that X and Y are independent and that the random variables Y_z are all centered. Then*

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{z\in Z}|X_z + Y_z| \ge \mathbf{E}\sup_{z\in Z}|X_z|.$$

Let $\underline{d} = \{d_n, n\ge 1\}$ be a sequence of reals. By the reduction step (28)

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}\Big|\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\sum_{n\in E_j} d_n\varepsilon_n n^{-\sigma-it}\Big| = \sup_{\underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\tau}\big|Q(\underline{z})\big|.$$

where

$$Q(\underline{z}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\sum_{n\in E_j} d_n\varepsilon_n n^{-\sigma}e^{2i\pi\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle}.$$

Introduce the following subset of $\mathbf{T}^\tau$,

$$\mathcal{Z} = \Big\{\underline{z} = \{z_j, 1\le j\le \tau\} : z_j = 0, \text{ if } j\le \tau/2, \text{ and } \ z_j\in\{0,1/2\}, \text{ if } j\in]\tau/2,\tau]\Big\}.$$

Observe that for any $\underline{z}\in\mathcal{Z}$, any n, $e^{2i\pi\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle} = \cos(2\pi\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle) = (-1)^{2\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle}$. It follows that $\Im Q(\underline{z}) = 0$, and so

$$Q(\underline{z}) = \sum_{\tau/2<j\le\tau}\sum_{n\in E_j} d_n\varepsilon_n n^{-\sigma}(-1)^{2\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle}, \qquad \underline{z}\in\mathcal{Z}.$$

Thereby the restriction of Q to $\mathcal{Z}$ is just a finite rank Rademacher process. Now define

$$\mathcal{L}_j = \Big\{n = p_j\,\tilde{n}\ :\ \tilde{n}\le\frac{N}{p_j} \text{ and } P^+(\tilde{n})\le p_{\tau/2}\Big\}, \qquad j\in(\tau/2,\tau].$$

Since $E_j\supset\mathcal{L}_j$, $j = 1,\dots\tau$, the sets $\mathcal{L}_j$ are pairwise disjoint. Put for $z\in\mathcal{Z}$,

$$Q'(\underline{z}) = \sum_{\tau/2<j\le\tau}\sum_{n\in\mathcal{L}_j}\varepsilon_n n^{-\sigma}(-1)^{2\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle}.$$

Since $\{Q(\underline{z}) - Q'(\underline{z}), \underline{z} \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ and $\{Q'(\underline{z}), \underline{z} \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ are independent, we deduce from the above Lemma that

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} |Q(\underline{z})| \ge \mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} |Q'(\underline{z})| .$$

It is possible to proceed to a direct evaluation of $Q'(\underline{z})$ and we recall that

$$\sup_{\underline{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} |Q'(\underline{z})| = \sum_{\tau/2 < j \le \tau} \big| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{L}_j} d_n \varepsilon_n n^{-\sigma} \big|,$$

which, in view of the Khintchine inequalities for Rademacher sums, allows to get ([8], Proposition 3.2)

Proposition 13 *There exists a universal constant c such that for any system of coefficients* (d_n)

$$c \sum_{\tau/2 < j \le \tau} \big| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{L}_j} d_n^2 n^{-2\sigma} \big|^{1/2} \le \mathbf{E} \sup_{\underline{z} \in \mathcal{Z}} |Q'(\underline{z})| \le \sum_{\tau/2 < j \le \tau} \big| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{L}_j} d_n^2 n^{-2\sigma} \big|^{1/2}.$$

Consequently

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{t \in \mathbf{R}} \big| \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \sum_{n \in E_j} d_n \varepsilon_n n^{-\sigma - it} \big| \ge c \sum_{\tau/2 < j \le \tau} \big| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{L}_j} d_n^2 n^{-2\sigma} \big|^{1/2}. \tag{94}$$

5 Proof of Theorem 4.

Proof of the lower bound. Take $d_n \equiv 1$ in estimate (94). We get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E} \sup_{t \in \mathbf{R}} \big| \sum_{\substack{n \le N \\ P^+(n) \le p_\tau}} \frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^{\sigma + it}} \big| &= \mathbf{E} \sup_{t \in \mathbf{R}} \big| \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} \sum_{n \in E_j} \frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^{\sigma + it}} \big| \\ &\ge c \sum_{\tau/2 < j \le \tau} \big| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{L}_j} \frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}} \big|^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

By assumption $\log \frac{N}{p_j} \ge \log \frac{N}{p_{\tau/2}} = \log N - \log p_{\tau/2} \gg p_{\tau/2}$. Owing to the very definition of the sets $\mathcal{L}_j$, and using Lemma 10, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\tau/2 < j \le \tau} \big| \sum_{n \in \mathcal{L}_j} \frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}} \big| &= \sum_{\tau/2 < j \le \tau} \frac{1}{p_j^\sigma} \Big[\sum_{\substack{\tilde{n} \le \frac{N}{p_j} \\ P^+(\tilde{n}) \le p_{\tau/2}}} \frac{1}{\tilde{n}^{2\sigma}} \Big]^{1/2} \\ &\ge C_\sigma \prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau} \Big[\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}} \Big]^{1/2} \sum_{\tau/2 < j \le \tau} \frac{1}{p_j^\sigma} \\ &\ge C_\sigma \prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau} \Big[\frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}} \Big]^{1/2} \frac{\tau^{1-\sigma}}{(\log \tau)^\sigma}. \end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

Consequently

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}\Big|\sum_{\substack{n\le N\\ P^+(n)\le p_\tau}}\frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^{\sigma+it}}\Big| \ge C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]^{1/2}\frac{\tau^{1-\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{\sigma}}. \tag{97}$$

And if $\sigma=1/2$, by Mertens Theorem,

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}\Big|\sum_{\substack{n\le N\\ P^+(n)\le p_\tau}}\frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^{\frac12+it}}\Big| \ge C\tau^{1/2}. \tag{98}$$

Proof of the upper bound. We have

$$\Upsilon(\underline{z}) \;=\; \sum_{n\in F_\tau}\frac{1}{n^{\sigma}}\big\{\vartheta_n\cos 2\pi\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle+\vartheta_n'\sin 2\pi\langle\underline{a}(n),\underline{z}\rangle\big\}.$$

And $\big\|\Upsilon(\underline{z})-\Upsilon(\underline{z}')\big\|_2^2\le 4\pi^2\sum_{n\in F_\tau}\frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}}\big[\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}a_j(n)|z_j-z_j'|\big]^2$.

Now

$$\sum_{n\in F_\tau}\frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}}\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}a_j(n)|z_j-z_j'|\Big]^2=\sum_{n\in F_\tau}\frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}}\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}a_j(n)^2|z_j-z_j'|^2$$

$$+\sum_{n\in F_\tau}\frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}}\sum_{1\le j_1\ne j_2\le\tau}a_{j_1}(n)a_{j_2}(n)|z_{j_1}-z_{j_1}'|\;|z_{j_2}-z_{j_2}'|:=S+R.$$

Further, by using Lemma 10

$$\begin{aligned}
R &\le \sum_{1\le j_1\ne j_2\le\tau}|z_{j_1}-z_{j_1}'|\;|z_{j_2}-z_{j_2}'|\sum_{b_1,b_2=1}^{\infty}b_1b_2\sum_{\substack{n\in F_\tau\\ a_{j_1}(n)=b_1\\ a_{j_2}(n)=b_2}}\frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}}\\
&\le C\sum_{1\le j_1\ne j_2\le\tau}|z_{j_1}-z_{j_1}'||z_{j_2}-z_{j_2}'|\sum_{b_1,b_2=1}^{\infty}\frac{b_1b_2}{p_{j_1}^{2b_1\sigma}p_{j_2}^{2b_2\sigma}}\Big[\sum_{\substack{m\le N/(p_{j_1}^{b_1}p_{j_2}^{b_2})\\ P^+(m)\le p_\tau}}\frac{1}{m^{2\sigma}}\Big]\\
&\le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]\sum_{1\le j_1\ne j_2\le\tau}\frac{|z_{j_1}-z_{j_1}'|}{p_{j_1}^{2\sigma}}\frac{|z_{j_2}-z_{j_2}'|}{p_{j_2}^{2\sigma}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
R &\le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{|z_j-z_j'|}{p_j^{2\sigma}}\Big)^2\\
&\le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{1}{p_j^{2\sigma}}\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{|z_j-z_j'|^2}{p_j^{2\sigma}}\Big)\\
&\le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]\Big(\frac{\tau^{1-2\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{2\sigma}}\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{|z_j-z_j'|^2}{p_j^{2\sigma}}\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
S &\le \sum_{n\in F_\tau}\frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}}\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}a_j(n)^2|z_j-z_j'|^2 \le \sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|z_j-z_j'|^2\sum_{b=1}^{\infty}b^2\sum_{\substack{n\in F_\tau\\ a_j(n)=b}}\frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}}\\
&\le \sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|z_j-z_j'|^2\sum_{b=1}^{\infty}\frac{b^2}{p_j^{2b\sigma}}\sum_{\substack{m\le N/p_j^b\\ P^+(m)\le p_\tau}}\frac{1}{m^{2\sigma}}\\
&\le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|z_j-z_j'|^2\sum_{b=1}^{\infty}\frac{b^2}{p_j^{2b\sigma}}\\
&\le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{|z_j-z_j'|^2}{p_j^{2\sigma}}. \qquad (100)
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently

$$\|\Upsilon(\underline{z})-\Upsilon(\underline{z})\|_2^2\le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]\Big(\frac{\tau^{1-2\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{2\sigma}}\Big)\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{|z_j-z_j'|^2}{p_j^{2\sigma}}\Big]. \qquad (101)$$

We deduce from Slepian's Lemma, noting that $\log p_\tau\sim\log\tau$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z},\underline{z}'\in T^\tau}|\Upsilon(\underline{z}')-\Upsilon(\underline{z})| &\le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]^{1/2}\Big(\frac{\tau^{\frac12-\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{\sigma}}\Big)\Big[\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{1}{p_j^{\sigma}}\Big]\\
&\le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]^{1/2}\Big(\frac{\tau^{\frac12-\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{\sigma}}\Big)\Big(\frac{\tau^{1-\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{\sigma}}\Big)\\
&= C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]^{1/2}\Big(\frac{\tau^{\frac32-2\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{2\sigma}}\Big).
\end{aligned}$$

But

$$\|\Upsilon(\underline{z})\|_2\le\Big[\sum_{n\in F_\tau}\frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}}\Big]^{1/2}\le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]^{1/2},\qquad \underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\tau. \qquad (102)$$

Thus

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}\in T^\tau}|\Upsilon(\underline{z})| \le C_\sigma\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell^{2\sigma}}}\Big]^{1/2}\Big(\frac{\tau^{\frac32-2\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{2\sigma}}\Big). \qquad (103)$$

Recall that we have denoted $\Pi_\sigma(\tau)=\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}(1-p_\ell^{-2\sigma})^{-1}$. By combining (103) with (97), we get

$$c_\sigma\frac{\Pi_\sigma(\tau)^{1/2}\,\tau^{1-\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{\sigma}}\le\mathbf{E}\sup_{t\in\mathbf{R}}\Big|\sum_{\substack{n\le N\\ P^+(n)\le p_\tau}}\frac{\varepsilon_n}{n^{\sigma+it}}\Big|\le C_\sigma\Big(\frac{\Pi_\sigma(\tau)^{1/2}\,\tau^{\frac32-2\sigma}}{(\log\tau)^{2\sigma}}\Big). \qquad (104)$$

If $\sigma=1/2$, the modifications for R and S are, by using Mertens Theorem

$$R \le C\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell}}\Big]\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{|z_j-z_j'|}{p_j}\Big)^2\le C(\log\tau)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{1}{p_j}\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{|z_j-z_j'|^2}{p_j}\Big)$$

$$\leq \quad C(\log\tau)(\log\log\tau)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{|z_j-z_j'|^2}{p_j}\Big), \tag{105}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|z_j-z_j'|^2\sum_{b=1}^{\infty}\frac{b^2}{p_j^b}\sum_{\substack{m\leq N/p_j^b\\ P^+(m)\leq p_\tau}}\frac{1}{m}\leq C\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell}}\Big]\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}|z_j-z_j'|^2\sum_{b=1}^{\infty}\frac{b^2}{p_j} \\ &\leq C(\log\tau)\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{|z_j-z_j'|^2}{p_j}. \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

Hence

$$\big\|\Upsilon(\underline{z})-\Upsilon(\underline{z})\big\|_2^2\leq C(\log\tau)(\log\log\tau)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{|z_j-z_j'|^2}{p_j}\Big). \tag{107}$$

And by Slepian's Lemma

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z},\underline{z}'\in T^\tau}|\Upsilon(\underline{z}')-\Upsilon(\underline{z})|\leq C(\log\tau)(\log\log\tau)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{\tau}\frac{1}{p_j^{1/2}}\Big)\leq C\big(\frac{\tau\log\log\tau}{\log\tau}\big)^{1/2}.$$

As

$$\|\Upsilon(\underline{z})\|_2\leq\big[\sum_{n\in F_\tau}\frac{1}{n}\big]^{1/2}\leq C\prod_{\ell=1}^{\tau}\Big[\frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p_\ell}}\Big]^{1/2}\leq C(\log\tau)^{1/2}, \qquad \underline{z}\in\mathbf{T}^\tau,$$

we conclude to

$$\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}\in T^\tau}|\Upsilon(\underline{z})|\leq C\tau^{1/2}(\log\log\tau)^{1/2}. \tag{108}$$

Combining this estimate with (98) finally gives

$$C_1\tau^{1/2}\leq\mathbf{E}\sup_{\underline{z}\in T^\tau}|\Upsilon(\underline{z})|\leq C_2\tau^{1/2}(\log\log\tau)^{1/2}. \tag{109}$$

■

Acknowledgments: I thank Mikhail Lifshits for stimulating comments.

References

[1] Bohr H. (1952) *Collected Mathematical Works*, Copenhagen.

[2] Hall R.R. (1973/74) *Halving an estimate from Selberg's upper bound method*, Acta Arithm. **25**, 347-351.

[3] Hildebrand A. (1985) *On Wirsing's mean value theorem for multiplicative functions*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **18**, 147-152.

[4] Halberstam H, Richert H.-E. (1979) *On a result of R. R. Hall*, J. Number Theory **11**, 76-89.

[5] Hardy G.H., Wright E.M. (1979) *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, Oxford University Press, Clarendon Press, Fifth ed.

[6] Kahane J. P. (1968) *Some random series of functions*, D. C. Heath and Co. Raytheon Education Co., Lexington, Mass.

[7] Lifshits M. (1995) *Gaussian Random Functions*, Kluwer, Dordrecht.

[8] Lifshits M., Weber M. (2006) *On the supremum of random Dirichlet polynomials.* Studia Math., **182**, 41–65.

[9] Lifshits M., Weber M. (2009) *On the supremum of some random Dirichlet polynomials*, Acta Math. Hungarica, **123** (1-2), 41-64.

[10] Peskir G., Schneider D., Weber M. (1996) *Randomly weighted series of contractions in Hilbert spaces*, Math. Scand. **79**, 263–282.

[11] Queffélec H. (1995) *H. Bohr's vision of ordinary Dirichlet series; old and new results*, J. Analysis **3**, 43-60.

[12] Tenenbaum G. (1990) *Introduction à la théorie analytique et probabiliste des nombres*, Revue de l'Institut Elie Cartan **13**, Département de Mathématiques de l'Université de Nancy 1.

[13] Weber M. (2000) *Estimating random polynomials by means of metric entropy methods*, Math. Inequal. Appl. **3**, no. 3, 443–457.

[14] Weber M. (2006) *On a stronger form of Salem-Zygmund inequality for random polynomials*, Periodica Math. Hung. **52**, No. 2, 73–104.

[15] Weber M. (2008) *On localization in Kronecker's diophantine theorem*, preprint available at www.arXiv:0806.3990v1.

MICHEL WEBER, MATHÉMATIQUE (IRMA), UNIVERSITÉ LOUIS-PASTEUR ET C.N.R.S., 7 RUE RENÉ DESCARTES, 67084 STRASBOURG CEDEX, FRANCE.
E-MAIL: `weber@math.u-strasbg.fr`